



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

10/607,257

06/27/2003

Kee Jin Mo

22987.03

4790

37833 7590 02/20/2008

LITMAN LAW OFFICES, LTD.

P.O. BOX 15035

CRYSTAL CITY STATION

ARLINGTON, VA 22215

EXAMINER

HOANG, HIEU T

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2152

MAIL DATE

DELIVERY MODE

02/20/2008

PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Art Unit: 2152

1. In response to applicant's arguments against the references individually, one cannot show nonobviousness by attacking references individually where the rejections are based on combinations of references. See *In re Keller*, 642 F.2d 413, 208 USPQ 871 (CCPA 1981); *In re Merck & Co.*, 800 F.2d 1091, 231 USPQ 375 (Fed. Cir. 1986).
2. The applicant argues that the prior art Babu-AAPA does not teach "information that can identify a site connected to one or more interfaces of each piece of network equipment". In response, the examiner respectfully disagrees. Babu-AAPA clearly teaches information for identifying a site connected to an interface of a network equipment (Babu, col. 8 lines 2-3, basic domain name in which the device is located). Furthermore, this limitation is known in the art (AAPA, fig. 2, network equipment interfaces and connected sites)
3. The applicant argues that each sub-code of Babu corresponds to each device, not device interface (last par. on p. 12). The examiner respectfully disagrees. Babu teaches sub-codes for each device (table 1, class "Cisco Router" is identified by sub-code "1.3.6.1.4.1.9.1," and any following sub-code in table 1 such as ".18" or ".131" further identifies the device among others in a same class.) AAPA teaches multiple device interfaces connected to sites (fig. 2). It would have been obvious for one skilled in the art at the time of the invention to combine the teachings of Babu and AAPA to identify sites connected to device's interfaces (AAPA) as taught by using sub-codes of Babu.

Art Unit: 2152

4. The applicant argues that each sub-code in AAPA does not correspond to “department node, equipment name” (last par. on page 13). This level of details is not in the independent claims. Furthermore, fig. 4 of AAPA clearly shows identifications up to a granularity of 9 different levels from company to line number. Applicant’s argument is vague by reciting “In AAPA, index is only allocated to, for example, “ABC company New Jersey branch office”, and the index is not allocated to, for example, “department, node, equipment name, etc.”

5. The applicant argues that the prior art does not teach user selectable rules (first par. page 14). In response, given the fact that New Jersey is a site ID sub-code and has to be entered by a person, it is well known how to type in a name for a site so that the name is selectable by a user. Furthermore, Babu teaches predefined codes for device classes “Cisco Router” is identified by sub-code “1.3.6.1.4.1.9.1”

6. Arguments regarded the new limitation added to claim 1 requires further search, because the applicant has changed some of the limitations in the previously presented claim 9, therefore the scope of claim 9 is now changed.

7. The applicant argues that the prior art does not teach an automatic management module (last par. on page 15). In response, it is maintained that Babu-AAPA teaches an automatic management module for confirming changes or adds of the interface information read from the polling agents, correcting or managing the interface information (col. 19 lines 60-67, fig. 4A, step 416, new device data is compared with stored device data; and in step 420, the stored device data is updated after device class has been mapped to an appropriate MIB set of DDD table in step 414); wherein said

Art Unit: 2152

automatic management module comprises a management target equipment list portion for managing interface changes (col. 10 lines 1-5 and 30-40), a code management portion for enabling information matched with each code to be input and displayed (fig. 4A, query using MIB sets to get managed device database), whereby the code is granted to a device connected to a port of each piece of network equipment at a pre-determined set of times using the management target list (fig. 4B, granting MIB sets based on a MIB set table) and comparing the collected information with the registration information in order to manage the network information automatically (table 5, table 6, comparing collected device interface data and database data on that device, fig. 4A, comparing FDDs)

8. The applicant argues that the prior art does not teach codes are granted based on pre-defined rules to identify a site (first par. p. 16). In response, Babu teaches predefined rules or which codes to use for which device classes “Cisco Router” is identified by sub-code “1.3.6.1.4.1.9.1”, and AAPA teaches sites connected to device interfaces. It would have been obvious for one skilled in the art at the time of the invention to combine the teachings of Babu and AAPA to identify sites connected to device's interfaces (AAPA) as taught by using sub-codes of Babu. Multi-step sub-codes are explained as above.